arXiv:1409.2410v6 [math.FA] 3 May 2016

TOEPLITZ OPERATORS IN A SYMMETRICALLY-NORMED IDEAL

ADAM ORENSTEIN

Abstract. We will give necessary and sufficient conditions for a Toeplitz operator T_ν, having a positive Borel measure ν for a symbol, on the Fock Space (also known as the Segal-Bargmann space) to be in the symmetrically-normed ideal $\mathcal{C}_\Phi$ for an arbitrary symmetric norming function Φ.

1. Introduction

Let $|\cdot|$ be the usual Euclidean norm and $d\mu$ be the Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$ centered at the origin and normalized so that the measure of $\mathbb{C}^n$ is 1. That is

$$d\mu(z) = \frac{e^{-|z|^2}}{\pi^n} dV(z)$$

where dV is the standard volume measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the inner product on $L^2(\mathbb{C}^n, d\mu)$ defined by

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} f(z)\overline{g(z)} d\mu(z) \text{ for all } f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{C}^n, d\mu)$$

and let $\| \cdot \|_2$ be the corresponding induced norm. Then the Fock space (also known as the Segal-Bargmann space) $H^2 = H^2(\mathbb{C}^n, d\mu)$ is defined as

$$H^2 = \{f \in L^2(\mathbb{C}^n, d\mu) : f \text{ is analytic on } \mathbb{C}^n\}.$$

One can show H^2 is a closed subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{C}^n, d\mu)$ with respect to $\| \cdot \|_2$. Thus H^2 is itself a Hilbert Space with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$.

Let $\mathfrak{L}(H^2)$ be the set of all bounded operators on H^2 with operator norm denoted by $\|\cdot\|$ and let $\mathfrak{LC}(H^2)$ be the set of all compact operators on H^2. For any $A \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$, we let A^* be the adjoint of A and $\sigma(A)$ be the spectrum of A. Let $P : L^2(\mathbb{C}^n, d\mu) \to H^2$ be the orthogonal

Date: May 4, 2016.
1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47B35; Secondary 47B10.
Key words and phrases. Toeplitz Operator; Fock Space; Symmetrically-Normed Ideal.

projection of $L^2(\mathbb{C}^n, d\mu)$ onto H^2. Then for any $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{C}^n, dV)$, the Toeplitz operator on H^2 with symbol f is the operator T_f defined by

$$T_f(g) = P(fg).$$

A straightforward calculation shows $\|T_f\| \leq \|f\|_\infty$. Thus $T_f \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$. Furthermore, for any $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ and $f, g \in L^\infty(\mathbb{C}^n, dV)$ direct calculation also yields

$$T_{af+bg} = aT_f + bT_g, (T_f)^* = T_{\overline{f}} \text{ and } f \geq 0 \text{ implies } T_f \geq 0.$$

More generally if ν is a complex Borel measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that ν satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |K(z,w)|\, e^{-|w|^2} d|\nu|(w) < \infty \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{C}^n \tag{1.1}$$

then we define the Toeplitz operator T_ν on H^2 by

$$T_\nu(g)(z) = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} K(z,w) g(w) e^{-|w|^2} d\nu(w), \text{ for all } g \in H^2 \text{ and all } z \in \mathbb{C}^n$$

where $K(z,w) = e^{z_1\overline{w_1}+\cdots+z_n\overline{w_n}}$ is the reproducing kernel of H^2 [4]. Because of (1.1) T_ν is well-defined on a dense subset of H^2, namely the set of all functions $g \in H^2$ such that

$$g(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j K(w, z_j)$$

where $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^N \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, $\{c_j\}_{j=1}^N \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ are arbitrary [12, page 41]. We will assume all of our measures satisfy (1.1). For convenience, let $\mathcal{D}(T_\nu)$ denote this dense set.

The purpose of this paper is to completely determine when T_ν is in a symmetrically-normed ideal $\mathcal{C}_\Phi$ for any symmetric-norming function Φ. The classification of Toeplitz operators T_ν for $\nu \geq 0$ in the Schatten p-classes $\mathcal{C}_{\Phi_p}$ for $p \geq 1$ on various spaces and domains has been extensively studied by many different authors [4, 14]. Kehe Zhu and Josh Isralowitz together gave necessary and sufficient conditions for when T_ν is in $\mathcal{C}_{\Phi_p}$ for all $p \geq 1$ [4]. Since the sets $\mathcal{C}_{\Phi_p}$ are symmetrically-normed ideals for all $p \geq 1$, this paper will generalize these results.

Furthermore there are symmetrically normed ideals which are very different from the Schatten p-classes. For instance, the finite rank operators are dense in $\mathcal{C}_{\Phi_p}$ for all $p \geq 1$. But it is shown in [3, page 141] how to construct Φ such that the finite rank operators are not dense in the symmetrically-normed ideal $\mathcal{C}_\Phi$.

Moreover in recent years, symmetrically-normed ideals have gained more attention. For instance, some results about diagonalizing a self-adjoint operator have been generalized from the symmetrically-normed

ideals $\mathcal{C}_{\Phi_1}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\Phi_2}$ to more general symmetrically-normed ideals [11, page 6].

2. More Notation and Two Important Functions

For any $z = (a_1 + ib_1, a_2 + ib_2, \ldots, a_n + ib_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^n, \{b_j\}_{j=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, define $|z|_\infty$ by

$$|z|_\infty = \max\{|a_j|, |b_j|\}_{j=1}^n.$$

Then

$$|z| \leq \sqrt{2n}|z|_\infty \text{ and } |z|_\infty \leq |z| \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{C}^n \tag{2.1}$$

[7, page 4]. For any $\delta > 0$, let $B(z, \delta) = \{w \in \mathbb{C}^n : |w - z|_\infty < \delta\}$ and $\overline{B(z, \delta)} = \{w \in \mathbb{C}^n : |w - z|_\infty \leq \delta\}$. For any $r > 0$, the r-lattice of $\mathbb{C}^n$ is defined as $\{r(b_1 + ic_1, \ldots, b_n + ic_n) : \{b_j\}_{j=1}^n, \{c_j\}_{j=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{Z}\}$. Since the r-lattice of $\mathbb{C}^n$ is countable, we can write the r-lattice of $\mathbb{C}^n$ as a sequence $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$. We also point out the following two useful facts about $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, the first of which is easy to prove and the second is due to Theorem 11.1 [7, page 91]:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{C}^n = \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty \overline{B\left(a_j, \frac{r}{2}\right)} \text{ and} \\ &\mu\left(\overline{B\left(a_j, \frac{r}{2}\right)} \cap \overline{B\left(a_k, \frac{r}{2}\right)}\right) = 0 \text{ if } k \neq j. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

For any $\alpha > 0$, let $\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha$ be the function on $\mathbb{C}^n$ defined by

$$\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha(z) = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} e^{-\alpha|z-w|^2} d\nu(w) \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

By (1.1), $\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha(z) < \infty$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ if ν is positive on $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $\alpha \geq 1$. We will see below that if ν is a positive Borel measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that $T_\nu \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$, then $\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha(z) < \infty$ for all $\alpha > 0$ and all $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$. For any $r > 0$ we define the function $\widehat{\nu}_r : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\widehat{\nu}_r(z) = \nu(B(z, r)) \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

3. Symmetric norms, symmetric norming functions and s-numbers

Here we will define symmetric norms, symmetric norming functions and symmetrically-normed ideals. For convenience, we will work on an arbitrary separable complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since we will be working with sequences, we will from now on say a sequence of real numbers $\{c_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is nonincreasing if $c_{j+1} \leq c_j$ for all $j \geq 1$ and nondecreasing if $c_j \leq c_{j+1}$ for all $j \geq 1$.

Let $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of all bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of all compact operators on $\mathcal{H}$. Denote the operator norm on $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ by $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$. For any $A \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$, let $\sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$ be the spectrum of A and A^* be the adjoint of A. For any $g, h \in \mathcal{H}$, let $g \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} h : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ be defined by

$$(g \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} h)(q) = (\langle q, h\rangle_{\mathcal{H}})\, g.$$

A norm $|\cdot|_{\mathcal{C}}$ defined on a two-sided ideal $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is called a symmetric norm if the following two conditions hold:

- For any $A, B \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ and $D \in \mathcal{C}$, $|ADB|_{\mathcal{C}} \leq \|A\|_{\mathcal{H}} |D|_{\mathcal{C}} \|B\|_{\mathcal{H}}$
- For any rank one operator T, $|T|_{\mathcal{C}} = \|T\|_{\mathcal{H}}$.

If in addition $\mathcal{C} \neq \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ is a Banach space with respect to $|\cdot|_{\mathcal{C}}$, then $\mathcal{C}$ is called a symmetrically-normed ideal.

Let $\widehat{c}$ be the set of all sequences of real numbers with only a finite number of nonzero terms. A function $\Phi : \widehat{c} \to [0, \infty)$ is called a symmetric norming function if Φ is a norm that has the following properties:

- $\Phi(1, 0, 0, \ldots) = 1$
- $\Phi(\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}) = \Phi\left(\{|\xi_{\theta(j)}|\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)$ for any bijection $\theta : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ and any $\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \widehat{c}$.

One of the main properties of symmetric norming functions is given in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Φ be a symmetric norming function and let $\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}, \{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \widehat{c}$. If*

$$|\xi_j| \leq |\eta_j| \text{ for all } j \geq 1,$$

then

$$\Phi(\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}) \leq \Phi(\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}).$$

A proof of this property can be found in [3, page 71-72]. It follows from Lemma 3 that if $\xi^m := \{\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_m, 0, 0, \ldots\}$ where $\xi = \{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is any sequence of real numbers and $m \geq 1$, then $\{\Phi(\xi^m)\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is a nondecreasing sequence. So we extend the definition of Φ by defining

$$\Phi\left(\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \Phi(\xi^m) \tag{3.1}$$

for any sequence of real numbers $\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$. With (3.1), one can easily generalize Lemma 3 to the set of all sequences of real numbers.

Let $(\widehat{c})^* = \{\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \widehat{c} : \xi_j \neq 0 \text{ for one or more } j\}$. For any two symmetric norming functions Ψ and Φ, we will as in [3, page 76] say Φ

and Ψ are equivalent if

$$\sup_{\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\in(\widehat{c})^*}\frac{\Phi(\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty})}{\Psi(\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty})}<\infty \text{ and } \sup_{\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\in(\widehat{c})^*}\frac{\Psi(\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty})}{\Phi(\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty})}<\infty. \quad (3.2)$$

We will denote the property of being equivalent by $\sim$. That is, we will write $\Phi\sim\Psi$ to mean Φ and Ψ are equivalent.

Here are two examples of symmetric norming functions:

- For any $p>0$, let $\Phi_p:\widehat{c}\to[0,\infty)$ be defined by
$$\Phi_p(\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty})=\left(\sum_j|\xi_j|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$
Then if $p\geq 1$, Φ_p is a symmetric norming function.
- Let $\Phi_\infty:\widehat{c}\to[0,\infty)$ be defined by
$$\Phi_\infty(\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty})=\sup_{j\geq 1}|\xi_j|.$$
Then Φ_∞ is a symmetric norming function. In fact by [3, page 77]
$$\Phi\sim\Phi_\infty \text{ if and only if } \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\Phi\left(\{\chi_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)<\infty \quad (3.3)$$
where by definition
$$\chi_j^{(n)}=\begin{cases}1 & \text{if } j\leq n\\ 0 & \text{if } j>n.\end{cases}$$

We also have the following lemma from [3, page 76]:

Lemma 3.2. *For any symmetric norming function Φ and $\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\in\widehat{c}$,*

$$\Phi_\infty(\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty})\leq\Phi\left(\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)\leq\Phi_1(\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty})$$

To define the s-numbers of any $A\in\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$, we will first define the numbers $\lambda_j(H)$ $(j=1,2,\ldots)$ for any $H\geq 0$.

A point $\lambda\in\sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$, where $A\in\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is self-adjoint, is called a point of the condensed spectrum of A if λ is either an accumulation point of $\sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$ or an eigenvalue of A of infinite multiplicity.

Let $H\geq 0$ and let $\eta=\sup\sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(H)$. If η is in the condensed spectrum of H, then we put

$$\lambda_j(H)=\eta \qquad (j=1,2,\ldots).$$

If η does not belong to the condensed spectrum of H, then it is an eigenvalue of finite multiplicity. In this case we put

$$\lambda_j(H)=\eta \qquad (j=1,2,\ldots,p)$$

where p is the multiplicity of the eigenvalue η.

In the latter case the remaining numbers $\lambda_j(H)$ $(j = p+1, \ldots)$ are defined by

$$\lambda_{p+j}(H) = \lambda_j(H_1) \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots)$$

where the operator H_1 is given by

$$H_1 = H - \eta P,$$

and P is the orthoprojector onto the eigenspace of the operator H corresponding to the eigenvalue η. The definition given above can also be found in [3, page 59].

For any $A \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$, we define the s-numbers of A, $s_j(A)$ $(j = 1, 2, \ldots)$, by

$$s_j(A) = \lambda_j(H) \ (j = 1, 2, \ldots)$$

where $H = (A^*A)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We will denote the sequence of s-numbers of A as $\{s_j(A)\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ enumerated so that $\{s_j(A)\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is nonincreasing and so as to include multiplicities. Note that this implies if $s_{j_1}(A) = \cdots = s_{j_N}(A)$ for some $\{j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_N\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, then $s_{j_1}(A)$ is listed N times in $\{s_j(A)\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$.

For any symmetric norming function Φ, let

$$\mathcal{C}_\Phi = \{A \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2) : \Phi\left(\{s_j(A)\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) < \infty\}.$$

By [3, page 80-82], $\mathcal{C}_\Phi$ is a symmetrically-normed ideal with corresponding symmetric norm $|\cdot|_\Phi$ defined by

$$|A|_\Phi = \Phi\left(\{s_j(A)\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right).$$

We also have the following result.

Proposition 3.3. *Let Φ and Ψ be two symmetric norming functions. Then*

$$\mathcal{C}_\Phi = \mathcal{C}_\Psi \text{ if and only if } \Phi \sim \Psi.$$

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) Assume $\mathcal{C}_\Phi = \mathcal{C}_\Psi$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of all elements in $\mathcal{C}_\Phi$ and let $|\cdot|_M : \mathcal{C} \to [0, \infty)$ be defined by

$$|\cdot|_M = \max\{|\cdot|_\Phi, |\cdot|_\Psi\}.$$

A straightforward calculation and Lemma 3.2 shows $|\cdot|_M$ is a norm on $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ is complete with respect to $|\cdot|_M$. Thus $\mathcal{C}$ is a Banach space with respect to $|\cdot|_M$.

Let $I : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}_\Phi$ be defined by $I(B) = B$. Then I is both bounded and bijective. So by Theorem 5.10 [8, page 100], there exists $\gamma_\Phi > 0$ such that

$$|B|_M \geq |I(B)|_\Phi \geq \gamma_\Phi |B|_M \qquad \text{for all } B \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Hence

$$|B|_M \geq |B|_\Phi \geq \gamma_\Phi |B|_M \qquad \text{for all } B \in \mathcal{C}$$

and $|\cdot|_M$ is equivalent to $|\cdot|_\Phi$. A similar argument yields a $\gamma_\Psi > 0$ such that

$$|B|_M \geq |B|_\Psi \geq \gamma_\Psi |B|_M \qquad \text{for all } B \in \mathcal{C}.$$

It follows that $|\cdot|_\Psi$ is equivalent to $|\cdot|_\Phi$.

Let $\mathfrak{LF}(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of all finite rank operators on $\mathcal{H}$. By proposition 5.5 [2, page 109], $\mathfrak{LF}(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. Let $\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \in (\widehat{c})^*$ where $(\widehat{c})^*$ is as in (3.2). Let $A \in \mathfrak{LF}(\mathcal{H})$ be defined by

$$A = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \eta_j e_j \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} e_j$$

where $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is an orthonormal set in $\mathcal{H}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $\eta_j = 0$ for all $j \geq N$. Then by the above work,

$$\frac{|A|_\Phi}{|A|_\Psi} \leq C_1 \text{ and } \frac{|A|_\Psi}{|A|_\Phi} \leq C_2 \tag{3.4}$$

for some positive constants C_1 and C_2 both of which are independent of N and $\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$. Furthermore by the definition of s-numbers

$$|A|_\Psi = \Psi\left(\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \text{ and } |A|_\Phi = \Phi\left(\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^\infty\right). \tag{3.5}$$

Combining (3.4) and (3.5) yields

$$\frac{\Phi\left(\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^\infty\right)}{\Psi\left(\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^\infty\right)} \leq C_1 \text{ and } \frac{\Psi\left(\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^\infty\right)}{\Phi\left(\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^\infty\right)} \leq C_2.$$

Since $\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \in (\widehat{c})^*$ was arbitrary, $\Phi \sim \Psi$.

($\Leftarrow$) If $\Phi \sim \Psi$, then clearly for any $A \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$, $\Phi\left(\{s_j(A)\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) < \infty$ if and only if $\Psi\left(\{s_j(A)\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) < \infty$. Therefore $\mathcal{C}_\Phi = \mathcal{C}_\Psi$.

□

4. Main Result

Our main goal is to prove the following Theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Let ν be a positive Borel measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$ and T_ν be the corresponding Toeplitz operator. Let $0 < s \leq 1$, $r > 0$ and $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be the r-lattice of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then for any symmetric norming function Φ,*

$$(T_\nu)^s \in \mathcal{C}_\Phi \text{ if and only if } \Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) < \infty.$$

5. Important results

5.1. **Toeplitz Operators and the Fock Space Revisited.** We will now state some important properties about Toeplitz operators and the Fock space that we will use to prove Theorem 4.1. A very useful relationship between $\widehat{\nu}_r$ and $\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha$ is given in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose ν is a positive Borel measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$, $r > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$. Then*

$$\widehat{\nu}_r(z) \leq e^{\alpha\sqrt{2n}r^2}\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha(z) \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{C}^n. \tag{5.1}$$

A proof of Lemma 5.1 can be easily made using (2.1) and the proof of Lemma 2.2 [4]. For any $z, w \in \mathbb{C}^n$, let

$$k_z(w) = \frac{K(w,z)}{\sqrt{K(z,z)}} = e^{(w_1\overline{z_1}+\cdots+w_n\overline{z_n})-\frac{|z|^2}{2}}.$$

The next result is Lemma 2.33 [12, page 64].

Lemma 5.2. *For all $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and for all $p > 0$,*

$$\left(\frac{p}{2\pi}\right)^n \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |k_z(w)|^p e^{-\frac{p|w|^2}{2}} dV(w) = 1.$$

We also have the following Theorem which completely determines when $T_\nu \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $r > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, $p > 0$, ν be a positive Borel measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be the r-lattice of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(1) $T_\nu \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$.
(2) There exists a constant $C > 0$ so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \left| f(w)e^{-\frac{\alpha|w|^2}{2}} \right|^p d\nu(w) \leq C \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \left| f(w)e^{-\frac{\alpha|w|^2}{2}} \right|^p dV(w)$$

for all $f \in H^2$.
(3) There exists a constant $C > 0$ so that $\widehat{\nu}_r(z) \leq C$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$.
(4) There exists a constant $C > 0$ so that $\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j) \leq C$ for all $j \geq 1$.

Proof. Here we will only show that (2) implies (1). For the other implications, see [4].

Let $f \in H^2$. Then by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi^n \|T_\nu(f)\|_2^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \left| \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} K(z,w) f(w) e^{-|w|^2} d\nu(w) \right|^2 e^{-|z|^2} dV(z) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \left| \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} K(z,w) f(w) e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2}} e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2}} e^{\frac{-|z|^2}{2}} d\nu(w) \right|^2 dV(z) \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \left(\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |K(z,w)|\, |f(w)| e^{-\frac{3|w|^2}{4}} e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{4}} e^{\frac{-|z|^2}{2}} d\nu(w) \right)^2 dV(z) \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |K(z,w)|\, |f(w)|^2 e^{\frac{-3|w|^2}{2}} e^{\frac{-|z|^2}{2}} d\nu(w) \times \\
&\times \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |K(z,w)|\, e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2}} e^{\frac{-|z|^2}{2}} d\nu(w) dV(z).
\end{aligned}$$

Since we are assuming (2), there exist a constant $C_1 > 0$ so that

$$\begin{gathered}
\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |K(z,w)|\, e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2}} d\nu(w) \leq C_1 \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |K(z,w)|\, e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2}} dV(w) \\
\text{and } \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |f(w)|^2 e^{-|w|^2} d\nu(w) \leq C_1 \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |f(w)|^2 e^{-|w|^2} dV(w)
\end{gathered}.$$

By Lemma 5.2,

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |K(z,w)|\, e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2}} dV(w) = \pi^n.$$

Then (2) and another application of Lemma 5.2 shows

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |K(z,w)|\, |f(w)|^2 e^{\frac{-3|w|^2}{2}} e^{\frac{-|z|^2}{2}} dV(z) d\nu(w) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |f(w)|^2 e^{-|w|^2} d\nu(w) \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |k_w(z)| e^{-\frac{|z|^2}{2}} dV(z) \\
&\leq C_1 \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |f(w)|^2 e^{-|w|^2} dV(w) \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |k_w(z)| e^{-\frac{|z|^2}{2}} dV(z) = C_1 \pi^n \|f\|_2^2
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by Fubini's Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |K(z,w)|\, |f(w)|^2 e^{\frac{-3|w|^2}{2}} e^{\frac{-|z|^2}{2}} d\nu(w) \times \\
&\times \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} |K(z,w)|\, e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2}} e^{\frac{-|z|^2}{2}} d\nu(w) dV(z) \\
&\leq \pi^{2n} C_1^2 \|f\|_2^2
\end{aligned}$$

and $T_\nu : H^2 \to L^2(\mathbb{C}^n, d\mu)$ is bounded. Then by another application of (2) and the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence theorem, $T_\nu(H^2) \subseteq H^2$. Therefore $T_\nu \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$.

□

In fact, if $T_\nu \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$ then a tedious but straightforward calculation using the reproducing property of $K(w,z)$, Fubini's theorem and Lemma 5.2 yields

$$\langle T_\nu(k_z), k_z\rangle = \widetilde{\nu}_1. \tag{5.2}$$

$\widetilde{\nu}_1$ is also known as the Berezin transform of ν [12].

The next result we will need is Theorem 5.4, which is Theorem 8.4 [5, page 108].

Theorem 5.4. *There exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $0 < \rho < \delta$ then for some positive constants $C_1(\rho)$ and $C_2(\rho)$,*

$$C_1(\rho)\|g\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\langle g, k_{b_j}\rangle|^2 \leq C_2(\rho)\|g\|_2^2 \tag{5.3}$$

for all $g \in H^2$ where $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is the ρ-lattice of $\mathbb{C}^n$.

5.2. **S.N Functions and S-Numbers Revisited.** We will now give some important results about symmetric norming functions and s-numbers. As in Section 3, we will work on an arbitrary separable complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. We will also use the same notation that was used in Section 3. The first lemma is based on the definition of s-numbers from Section 3 and also [3, pages 60-61].

Lemma 5.5. *Let $C, D \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Then*

(1) $s_1(D) = \|D\|_{\mathcal{H}}$.
(2) $s_j(C|D|C^*)) \leq \|C\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 s_j(|D|)$ for all $j \geq 1$.
(3) $s_j(D) = s_j(|D|)$ for all $j \geq 1$.
(4) If $0 \leq C \leq D$, then $s_j(C) \leq s_j(D)$ for all $j \geq 1$.

Remark 5.6. An immediate consequence of Lemma 5.5 is $|\cdot|_{\Phi_\infty} = \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$. Hence $\mathcal{C}_{\Phi_\infty} = \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ and by Proposition 3.3

$$\mathcal{C}_\Phi = \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}) \text{ if and only if } \Phi \sim \Phi_\infty. \tag{5.4}$$

Furthermore since $\mathcal{H}$ is separable, if $\mathcal{C}$ is a symmetrically-normed ideal then either $\mathcal{C} = \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ or $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H})$. So by (5.4)

$$\mathcal{C}_\Phi \subseteq \mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H}) \text{ if and only if } \Phi \nsim \Phi_\infty$$

The next lemma is based on proposition 1.19 [14, page 13] and Corollary 5.4 [1, page 47].

Lemma 5.7. *Let $T \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Then $T \in \mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H})$ if and only if*

$$T = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \sigma_j \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} e_j$$

for some orthonormal sets $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ *and* $\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ *in* $\mathcal{H}$ *and some sequence* $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ *of complex numbers satisfying* $\lim_{j\to\infty}\lambda_j = 0$. *If so then* $\{s_j(T) : j \geq 1\} = \{|\lambda_j| : j \geq 1\}$.

Now we will prove a proposition that will allow us to express the s-numbers of A^s in terms of the s-numbers of A if $A \geq 0$ and $A \in \mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H})$.

Proposition 5.8. *Let* $A \in \mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H})$ *such that* $A \geq 0$. *Then for any nonnegative function* f *which is bounded on* $\mathbb{C}$, *continuous at 0 and satisfies* $f(0) = 0$, *the following statements hold:*

(1) $f(A) \geq 0$
(2) $f(A) \in \mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H})$
(3) $\{f(s_j(A)) : j \geq 1\} = \{s_j(f(A)) : j \geq 1\}$.
(4) If f *is nondecreasing on* $\sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$, *then* $f(s_j(A)) = s_j(f(A))$ *for all* $j \geq 1$.

Proof. Since $A \in \mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H})$ and $A \geq 0$, $A = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} s_j(A)e_j \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} e_j$ for some orthonormal set $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ by Lemma 5.7. Now $f(A) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} f(s_j(A))e_j \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} e_j$ [1, page 56]. Hence $f(A) \geq 0$. Also since $A \in \mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H})$, $\lim_{j\to\infty} s_j(A) = 0$ by Lemma 5.7. Hence by our assumptions on f, $\lim_{j\to\infty} f(s_j(A)) = 0$. Then by another application of Lemma 5.7, $f(A) \in \mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H})$, $f(A) \geq 0$, and $\{f(s_j(A)) : j \geq 1\} = \{s_j(f(A)) : j \geq 1\}$.

Now assume f is nondecreasing on $\sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$. Note that since $A \geq 0$, proposition 4.15 [2, page 78] tells us $\sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(A) \subseteq [0, \infty)$. Then since $\{s_j(A)\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$, $f(s_1(A)) \geq f(s_2(A)) \geq \cdots \geq 0$. It is also true that $s_1(f(A)) \geq s_2(f(A)) \geq \cdots \geq 0$. It follows easily that $s_1(f(A)) = f(s_1(A))$. Then by induction $s_j(f(A)) = f(s_j(A))$ for all $j \geq 1$. Therefore the proposition holds.

□

We also have the following useful results.

Proposition 5.9. *Let* $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \widehat{c}$ *and* Φ *be a symmetric norming function. Suppose* $\{p_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ *such that for each* j *and* v *with* $j \neq v$, *we have* $p_j \neq p_v$. *Then* $\Phi\left(\{\lambda_{p_j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq \Phi\left(\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)$.

Proof. Let $N \geq 1$ and Θ be a bijection of $\mathbb{N}$ so that $\Theta(j) = p_j$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, N$. Such a Θ exist since $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ and $\{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_N\}$

have the same cardinality. Then by Lemma 3 and the definition of Θ,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi\left(\lambda_{p_1},\lambda_{p_2},\ldots,\lambda_{p_N},0,\ldots\right) &= \Phi\left(\left|\lambda_{p_1}\right|,\left|\lambda_{p_2}\right|,\ldots,\left|\lambda_{p_N}\right|,0,\ldots\right)\\ &= \Phi\left(\left|\lambda_{\Theta(1)}\right|,\left|\lambda_{\Theta(2)}\right|,\ldots,\left|\lambda_{\Theta(N)}\right|,0,\ldots\right)\\ &\leq \Phi\left(\left\{\left|\lambda_{\Theta(j)}\right|\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)\\ &= \Phi\left(\left\{\lambda_j\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\Phi\left(\lambda_{p_1},\lambda_{p_2},\ldots,\lambda_{p_N},0,\ldots\right) \leq \Phi\left(\left\{\lambda_j\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)$. Since $N \geq 1$ was arbitrary, (3.1) yields $\Phi\left(\left\{\lambda_{p_j}\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq \Phi\left(\left\{\lambda_j\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)$. □

Proposition 5.10. *Let $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequences of complex numbers. Let $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be two orthonormal sets in $\mathcal{H}$. If $D = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j b_j \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} e_j$ and D is bounded, then for any symmetric norming function Φ,*

$$|D|_{\Phi} = \Phi\left(\left\{\lambda_j\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right).$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.5, $|D|_{\Phi} = |\left(|D|\right)|_{\Phi}$. Also by direct calculation $|D| = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_j| e_j \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} e_j$. Because of this, we may assume without loss of generality that $\lambda_j \geq 0$ and $b_j = e_j$ for all $j \geq 1$.

By definition of D, $\sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(D) = \overline{\{\lambda_j : j \geq 1\}}$ where $\overline{\{\lambda_j : j \geq 1\}}$ is the closure of $\{\lambda_j : j \geq 1\}$ in $[0,\infty)$. Since by definition of the s-numbers $\{s_j(D) : j \geq 1\} \subseteq \sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(D)$, we have $\{s_j(D) : j \geq 1\} \subseteq \overline{\{\lambda_j : j \geq 1\}}$.

Suppose $\{s_j(D) : j \geq 1\} \subseteq \{\lambda_j : j \geq 1\}$. Recall from Section 3 that the sequence $\{s_j(D)\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is enumerated so as to include multiplicities. This implies that for each $j \geq 1$ there exist $p_j \geq 1$ so that $s_j(D) = \lambda_{p_j}(D)$ and so that $j \neq m$ implies $p_j \neq p_m$. Thus $|D|_{\Phi} = \Phi\left(\left\{\lambda_{p_j}\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)$. By Proposition 5.9, $\Phi\left(\left\{\lambda_{p_j}\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq \Phi\left(\left\{\lambda_j\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)$ and so we have

$$|D|_{\Phi} \leq \Phi\left(\left\{\lambda_j\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right). \tag{5.5}$$

Assume instead $\{s_j(D) : j \geq 1\} \not\subseteq \{\lambda_j : j \geq 1\}$. Then by the above statements there exist $j \geq 1$ so that $s_j(D)$ is an accumulation point of $\{\lambda_j : j \geq 1\}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. We claim that

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{for each } j \geq 1 \text{ there exist } p_j \geq 1 \text{ such that } s_j(D) - \frac{\epsilon}{2^j} \leq \lambda_{p_j}\\ &\text{and so that } m \neq j \text{ implies } p_m \neq p_j.\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

To prove the claim, let j_0 be the smallest positive integer such that $s_{j_0}(D)$ is an accumulation point of $\{\lambda_j : j \geq 1\}$.

If $j_0 = 1$, then there exist a subsequence $\{\lambda_{p_j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ of $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ satisfying $s_1(D) - \frac{\epsilon}{2^j} \leq \lambda_{p_j}$ for all $j \geq 1$. Also by definition of the s-numbers, $s_j(D) = s_1(D)$ for all $j \geq 1$. Thus $s_j(D) - \frac{\epsilon}{2^j} \leq \lambda_{p_j}$ for all $j \geq 1$ and (5.6) holds.

So assume $j_0 > 1$. Then $\{s_j(D) : 1 \leq j \leq j_0 - 1\} \subseteq \{\lambda_j : j \geq 1\}$. It follows, as above, that for each j with $1 \leq j \leq j_0 - 1$ there exist $p_j \geq 1$ so that $s_j(D) = \lambda_{p_j}$ and so that $1 \leq m \leq j_0 - 1$ with $m \neq j$ implies $p_j \neq p_m$. Let $v = \max\{p_1, \ldots, p_{j_0-1}\}$. Since $s_{j_0}(D)$ is an accumulation point of $\{\lambda_j : j \geq 1\}$, $s_{j_0}(D)$ is an accumulation point of $\{\lambda_j : j > v\}$. This means there exist a subsequence $\{\lambda_{n_j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ of $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=v+1}^{\infty}$ such that $s_{j_0}(D) - \frac{\epsilon}{2^{j_0+j-1}} \leq \lambda_{n_j}$ for all $j \geq 1$. Again by definition of the s-numbers, $s_j(D) = s_{j_0}(D)$ for all $j \geq j_0$. Thus setting $p_{j_0-1+d} = n_d$ for all $d \geq 1$, the above work yields $s_j(D) - \frac{\epsilon}{2^j} \leq \lambda_{p_j}$ for all $j \geq 1$ and again (5.6) holds.

By (5.6), the triangle inequality for Φ, Lemma 3, Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 5.9

$$\begin{aligned}
|D|_\Phi - \epsilon \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^j &\leq |D|_\Phi - \epsilon\Phi\left(\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^j\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \\
&\leq \Phi\left(\left\{s_j(D) - \frac{\epsilon}{2^j}\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \\
&\leq \Phi\left(\{\lambda_{p_j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \\
&\leq \Phi\left(\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $1 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^j$ and $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we again have (5.5).

Let $N \geq 1$ and $P_N = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_j e_j \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} e_j$. Then $0 \leq P_N \leq D$. It follows from Lemma 3 and Lemma 5.5 that $|P_N|_\Phi \leq |D|_\Phi$. Moreover $|P_N|_\Phi = \Phi(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_N, 0, \ldots)$ by definition of the s-numbers. This implies $\Phi(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_N, 0, \ldots) \leq |D|_\Phi$. Since $N \geq 1$ was arbitrary, (3.1) implies

$$\Phi\left(\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq |D|_\Phi.$$

Therefore by the above and (5.5),

$$|D|_\Phi = \Phi\left(\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right).$$

□

The next result, which is Theorem 5.1 [3, page 85] will be used to prove Proposition 5.12 below.

Lemma 5.11. *Let Φ be an arbitrary symmetric norming function such that $\Phi \backsim \Phi_\infty$. If an operator $A \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is the weak limit of a sequence $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ from $\mathcal{C}_\Phi$ and if $\sup_n |A_n|_\Phi < \infty$, then $A \in \mathcal{C}_\Phi$ and $|A|_\Phi \leq \sup_n |A_n|_\Phi$.*

Proposition 5.12. *Let $0 < s \leq 1$ and Φ be a symmetric norming function. If $\{H_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ then there exists a $C > 0$ so that*

$$\left|\left|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} H_j\right|^s\right|_{\Phi} \leq C 2^{1-s} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} ||H_j|^s|_{\Phi}.$$

$$\left|\left|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} H_j\right|^s\right|_{\Phi} \leq 2^{1-s} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} ||H_j|^s|_{\Phi}.$$

Proof. Clearly we may assume $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} ||H_j|^s|_{\Phi} < \infty$. Note by the continuous functional calculus [13, page 62], $\||A|^s\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|A\|_{\mathcal{H}}^s$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Thus by Lemma 3.2 and the fact that $0 < s \leq 1$,

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|H_j\|_{\mathcal{H}}\right)^s \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|H_j\|_{\mathcal{H}}^s = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \||H_j|^s\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} ||H_j|^s|_{\Phi}. \tag{5.7}$$

Hence

$$\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} H_j\right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^s \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|H_j\|_{\mathcal{H}}^s \leq 2^{1-s} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} ||H_j|^s|_{\Phi}.$$

Thus if $\Phi \sim \Phi_{\infty}$

$$\left|\left|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} H_j\right|^s\right|_{\Phi} \leq C_1 \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} H_j\right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^s \leq C_1 2^{1-s} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} ||H_j|^s|_{\Phi}$$

for some $C_1 > 0$.

Now assume $\Phi \nsim \Phi_{\infty}$. Then by Remark 5.6, $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} ||H_j|^s|_{\Phi} < \infty$ implies $|H_j|^s \in \mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H})$ for all $j \geq 1$. So by Proposition 5.8 $|H_j| \in \mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H})$ which itself gives us $H_j \in \mathfrak{LC}(\mathcal{H})$ for every $j \geq 1$. Hence Lemma 5.7 implies there exist, for each $j \geq 1$, two orthonormal sets $\left\{\eta_q^{(j)}\right\}_{q=1}^{\infty}$ and $\left\{\sigma_p^{(j)}\right\}_{p=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ such that $H_j = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} s_p(H_j) \eta_p^{(j)} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} \sigma_p^{(j)}$ and $\lim_{p\to\infty} s_p(H_j) = 0$.

Let $M \geq 1$ and $N \geq 1$. Let $F_N^{(j)} = \sum_{p=1}^{N} s_p(H_j) \eta_p^{(j)} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} \sigma_p^{(j)}$. Then by Lemma 3.1 [10, page 1004],

$$\left|\left|\sum_{j=1}^{M} F_N^{(j)}\right|^s\right|_{\Phi} \leq 2^{1-s} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \left|\left|F_N^{(j)}\right|^s\right|_{\Phi}. \tag{5.8}$$

It is also true by definition of the s-numbers and Proposition 5.8 that

$$||F_N^{(j)}|^s|_{\Phi} = \Phi\left(|s_1\left(H_j\right)|^s, |s_2\left(H_j\right)|^s, \ldots, |s_N\left(H_j\right)|^s, 0, \ldots\right)$$

for all $j \geq 1$. It follows from Lemma 3 that

$$\left|\left|F_N^{(j)}\right|^s\right|_\Phi \leq ||H_j|^s|_\Phi \tag{5.9}$$

for all $j \geq 1$. Then combining (5.8) and (5.9) gives us

$$\left|\left|\sum_{j=1}^M F_N^{(j)}\right|^s\right|_\Phi \leq 2^{1-s}\sum_{j=1}^M ||H_j|^s|_\Phi \leq 2^{1-s}\sum_{j=1}^\infty ||H_j|^s|_\Phi \text{ for all } N \geq 1. \tag{5.10}$$

Furthermore since $\lim_{p\to\infty} s_p(H_j) = 0$ for all $j \geq 1$, $\{F_N^{(j)}\}_{N=1}^\infty$ converges to H_j with respect to the norm topology. Then the Stone-Weierstrass theorem and the continuous functional calculus [13, page 62] yields
$\left\{\left|\sum_{j=1}^M F_N^{(j)}\right|^s\right\}_{N=1}^\infty$ converges to $\left|\sum_{j=1}^M H_j\right|^s$ with respect to the norm topology. Then by (5.10) and Lemma 5.11,

$$\left|\left(\sum_{j=1}^M H_j\right)^s\right|_\Phi \leq 2^{1-s}\sum_{j=1}^\infty ||H_j|^s|_\Phi \text{ for any } M \geq 1.$$

Moreover since $\sum_{j=1}^\infty ||H_j|^s|_\Phi < \infty$, (5.7) implies $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \|H_j\|_\mathcal{H} < \infty$. It follows that $\{\sum_{j=1}^M H_j\}_{M=1}^\infty$ converges to $\sum_{j=1}^\infty H_j$ in the norm topology. Thus another application of the continuous functional calculus [13, page 62] and the Stone-Weierstrass theorem shows $\left\{\left|\sum_{j=1}^M H_j\right|^s\right\}_{M=1}^\infty$ converges to $\left|\sum_{j=1}^\infty H_j\right|^s$ in the norm topology. Then by another application Lemma 5.11,

$$\left|\left|\sum_{j=1}^\infty H_j\right|^s\right|_\Phi \leq 2^{1-s}\sum_{j=1}^\infty ||H_j|^s|_\Phi.$$

Therefore with $C = \max\{C_1, 1\}$, we have

$$\left|\left|\sum_{j=1}^\infty H_j\right|^s\right|_\Phi \leq C2^{1-s}\sum_{j=1}^\infty ||H_j|^s|_\Phi.$$

□

6. Proof of Main Result

From now on, we will use the following notation: for any $g, h \in H^2$, let $g \otimes h$ be the operator on H^2 defined by $(g \otimes h)(v) = \langle v, h\rangle g$.

6.1. **An Important Proposition and Corollary.** We will now prove the following theorem, which will be very useful in proving Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\rho > 0$ $\gamma > 0$, $\alpha > 0$ $0 < s \leq 1$, and $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be the ρ-lattice of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Let ν be a positive Borel measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$ and Φ be a symmetric norming function. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-s\gamma^2\alpha(2n)}\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_\gamma(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) &\leq \Phi\left(\{(\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \\ &\leq C\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_\rho(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $C = e^{s\alpha 4n^2\rho^2}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}(2m+1)^{2n}e^{-s\alpha\rho^2(m-2n)^2}$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.1

$$\widehat{\nu}_\gamma(b_j) \leq e^{\gamma^2\alpha(2n)}\left(\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha\right)(b_j) \text{ for all } j \geq 1.$$

Then by Lemma 3,

$$e^{-s\gamma^2\alpha(2n)}\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_\gamma(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq \Phi\left(\{(\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right).$$

For any $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and any $A \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, let $A + \{z\} = \{a + z : a \in A\}$. Then by the definition of a ρ-lattice as in Section 2,

$$\{b_q\}_{q=1}^{\infty} = \{b_q\}_{q=1}^{\infty} + \{b_j\} \text{ for all } j \geq 1. \tag{6.1}$$

From the above and the fact that $\mathbb{C}^n = \bigcup_{q=1}^{\infty} B(b_q, \rho)$, it follows that $\mathbb{C}^n = \bigcup_{q=1}^{\infty} B(b_j + b_q, \rho)$ for every $j \geq 1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha(b_j))^s &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} e^{-\alpha|z-b_j|^2}d\nu(z)\right)^s \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{q=1}^{\infty}\int_{B(b_q+b_j,\rho)} e^{-\alpha|z-b_j|^2}d\nu(z)\right)^s \\ &\leq \sum_{q=1}^{\infty}\left(\int_{B(b_q+b_j,\rho)} e^{-\alpha|z-b_j|^2}d\nu(z)\right)^s \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

For any $z \in B(b_q + b_j, \rho)$, we have by (2.1)

$$|z - (b_q + b_j)| \leq \sqrt{2n}|z - (b_q + b_j)|_\infty < \rho\sqrt{2n}.$$

Then from the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} |z - b_j|^2 \geq (|z - (b_j + b_q)| - |b_q|)^2 &\geq |b_q|^2 - 2|z - (b_j + b_q)||b_q| \\ &\geq |b_q|^2 - 2\rho\sqrt{2n}|b_q|. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{q=1}^{\infty}&\left(\int_{B(b_q+b_j,\rho)} e^{-\alpha|z-b_j|^2}d\nu(z)\right)^s \\ &\le \sum_{q=1}^{\infty}\left(\int_{B(b_q+b_j,\rho)} e^{-\alpha|b_q|^2+2\alpha\rho\sqrt{2n}|b_q|}d\nu(z)\right)^s \qquad (6.3)\\ &= \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} e^{-s\alpha|b_q|^2+2s\alpha\rho\sqrt{2n}|b_q|}\left(\widehat{\nu}_\rho(b_q+b_j)\right)^s.\end{aligned}$$

So by Lemma 3, (6.2) and (6.3),

$$\Phi\left(\{(\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \le \Phi\left(\left\{\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} e^{-s\alpha|b_q|^2+2s\alpha\rho\sqrt{2n}|b_q|}\left(\widehat{\nu}_\rho(b_q+b_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right).$$

Then by the triangle inequality for Φ and (6.1),

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi\left(\left\{\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} e^{-s\alpha|b_q|^2+2s\alpha\rho\sqrt{2n}|b_q|}\left(\widehat{\nu}_\rho(b_q+b_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)\\ &\le \sum_{q=1}^{\infty}\Phi\left(e^{-s\alpha|b_q|^2+2s\alpha\rho\sqrt{2n}|b_q|}\{(\widehat{\nu}_\rho(b_q+b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)\\ &= \left[\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} e^{-s\alpha|b_q|^2+2s\alpha\rho\sqrt{2n}|b_q|}\right]\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_\rho(b_q+b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)\\ &= \left[\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} e^{-s\alpha|b_q|^2+2s\alpha\rho\sqrt{2n}|b_q|}\right]\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_\rho(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right).\end{aligned}$$

By (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} e^{-s\alpha|b_q|^2+2s\alpha\rho\sqrt{2n}|b_q|} &\le \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} e^{-s\alpha|b_q|_\infty^2+s\alpha 4n\rho|b_q|_\infty}\\ &= \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} e^{-s\alpha|b_q|_\infty^2+s\alpha 4n\rho|b_q|_\infty-s\alpha 4n^2\rho^2+s\alpha 4n^2\rho^2}\\ &= \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} e^{-s\alpha(|b_q|_\infty-2n\rho)^2+s\alpha 4n^2\rho^2}\\ &= e^{s\alpha 4n^2\rho^2}\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} e^{-s\alpha(|b_q|_\infty-2n\rho)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

By definition of a ρ-lattice, $b_q = \rho(j_1^{(q)} + il_1^{(q)}, \ldots, j_n^{(q)} + il_n^{(q)})$ for some $j_1^{(q)}, l_1^{(q)}, \ldots, j_n^{(q)}, \ldots, l_n^{(q)} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus $|b_q|_\infty = \rho \max\left\{\left|j_d^{(q)}\right|, \left|l_d^{(q)}\right|\right\}_{d=1}^n$. Thus for any $m \geq 0$, $|b_q|_\infty \leq \rho m$ if and only if $|j_d^{(q)}| \leq m$ and $|l_d^{(q)}| \leq m$ for each $1 \leq d \leq n$. Moreover the number of integers j satisfying $|j| \leq m$ is $2m+1$. This means the cardinality of the set $\{q \in \mathbb{N} : |b_q|_\infty = m\rho\}$ is not larger than $(2m+1)^{2n}$. So with $B_m = \{q \in \mathbb{N} : |b_q|_\infty = \rho m\}$ the above statements tells us

$$e^{s\alpha 4n^2\rho^2} \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} e^{-s\alpha(|b_q|_\infty - 2n\rho)^2} = e^{s\alpha 4n^2\rho^2} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{q \in B_m} e^{-s\alpha(|b_q|_\infty - 2n\rho)^2}$$
$$\leq e^{s\alpha 4n^2\rho^2} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (2m+1)^{2n} e^{-s\alpha\rho^2(m-2n)^2}.$$

By he Ratio Test for series, $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}(2m+1)^{2n}e^{-s\alpha\rho^2(m-2n)^2}$ converges.

So with $C = e^{s\alpha 4n^2\rho^2}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}(2m+1)^{2n}e^{-s\alpha\rho^2(m-2n)^2}$,

$$\Phi\left(\{(\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \leq C\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_\rho(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right).$$

Therefore

$$e^{-s\alpha\gamma^2(2n)}\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_\gamma(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \leq \Phi\left(\{(\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \leq C\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_\rho(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right).$$

□

6.2. **Proof of Sufficiency.** We are now ready to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 6.2. *Let Φ be a symmetric norming function, $0 < s \leq 1$, $r > 0$, $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be the r-lattice of $\mathbb{C}^n$, ν be a positive Borel measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$ and T_ν be the corresponding Toeplitz operator. Then for some constant $C = C(r,s) > 0$,*

$$|\,(T_\nu)^s\,|_\Phi \leq C\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right).$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the above assuming $\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) < \infty$. From Theorem 5.3 and Lemma 3.2, $\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) < \infty$ implies $\|T_\nu\| < \infty$. Let δ be as in Theorem 5.4 and choose $M \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M > 2$ and such that $\frac{r}{M} < \delta$. For ease of notation, let $\rho = \frac{r}{M}$. Let $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be the ρ-lattice of $\mathbb{C}^n$, $\{e_{b_j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal set in H^2 and let $B^{(\rho)}$ be the operator on H^2 defined by

$$B^{(\rho)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e_{b_j} \otimes k_{b_j}.$$

For any $f, g \in H^2$ we have by Bessel's inequality, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 2.1 [4],

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle B^{(\rho)}g, f\rangle| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\langle f, e_{b_j}\rangle||\langle k_{b_j}, g\rangle| \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\langle f, e_{b_j}\rangle||g(b_j)|e^{\frac{-|b_j|^2}{2}} \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\langle f, e_{b_j}\rangle|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |g(b_j)|^2 e^{-|b_j|^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \qquad (6.4) \\
&\leq \|f\|_2 J \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{B(b_j,\rho)} |g(z)|^2 e^{-|z|^2} dV(z)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \pi^n J q \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

where $J = J(\rho, n) > 0$ and where $q \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that every $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ lies in at most q of the sets $B(b_j, \rho)$. Such an q clearly exists. Since $f, g \in H^2$ were arbitrary, (6.4) implies $\|B^{(\rho)}\| \leq qJ$ and $B^{(\rho)} \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$.

Let

$$\Gamma^{(\rho)} = \left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)}. \qquad (6.5)$$

This means $\Gamma^{(\rho)} \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$ and $\langle \Gamma^{(\rho)}g, g\rangle = \langle B^{(\rho)}g, B^{(\rho)}g\rangle$ for all $g \in H^2$. Hence

$$\langle \Gamma^{(\rho)}g, g\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left|\langle g, k_{b_j}\rangle\right|^2.$$

So $\Gamma^{\rho} \geq 0$ and by Theorem 5.4, there exist a constant $W_1(\rho) > 0$ so that

$$W_1(\rho)\|g\|_2^2 \leq \langle \Gamma^{(\rho)}g, g\rangle \text{ for all } g \in H^2.$$

Thus $\Gamma^{(\rho)}$ is bounded above and bounded below on H^2 [2, page 76]. Hence by Corollary 4.9 [2, page 76], $\Gamma^{(\rho)}$ is invertible on H^2. Thus we may write

$$T_\nu = {\Gamma^{(\rho)}}^{-1} \Gamma^{(\rho)} T_\nu \Gamma^{(\rho)} {\Gamma^{(\rho)}}^{-1}.$$

Then from (6.5), we get

$$T_\nu = {\Gamma^{(\rho)}}^{-1} \left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)} T_\nu \left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)} {\Gamma^{(\rho)}}^{-1}. \qquad (6.6)$$

We claim that

$$|(T_\nu)^s|_\Phi \leq C_1 |\left(B^{(\rho)} T_\nu \left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^*\right)^s|_\Phi \qquad (6.7)$$

for some constant $C_1 = C_1(\rho, n, s) > 0$. To prove this claim, first note if $|\left(B^{(\rho)} T_\nu \left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^*\right)^s|_\Phi = \infty$, then the above clearly holds. So assume

instead $|\left(B^{(\rho)}T_\nu\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^*\right)^s|_\Phi < \infty$. If $\Phi \nsim \Phi_\infty$, then by Remark 5.6, Lemma 5.5 and Proposition 5.8 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left(\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)}T_\nu\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)}\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\right)^s\right|_\Phi \\
&= \Phi\left(\left\{s_j\left(\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)}T_\nu\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)}\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \\
&\leq \|\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^*\|^{2s}\Phi\left(\{s_j(B^{(\rho)}T_\nu\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^*)^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \\
&= \|\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^*\|^{2s}\left|\left(B^{(\rho)}T_\nu\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^*\right)^s\right|_\Phi
\end{aligned}$$

If instead $\Phi \sim \Phi_\infty$ then for some $V > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left(\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)}T_\nu\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)}\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\right)^s\right|_\Phi \\
&\leq V\left\|\left(\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)}T_\nu\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)}\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\right)^s\right\| \\
&= V\left\|\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)}T_\nu\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* B^{(\rho)}\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\right\|^s \\
&\leq V\left\|\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^*\right\|^{2s}\left\|\left(B^{(\rho)}T_\nu\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^*\right)^s\right\| \\
&\leq V\left\|\Gamma^{(\rho)^{-1}}\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^*\right\|^{2s}\left|\left(B^{(\rho)}T_\nu\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^*\right)^s\right|_\Phi
\end{aligned}$$

where the latter inequality follows by Lemma 3.2. Thus (6.7) holds.

By direct calculation and [6, page 188-191]

$$B^{(\rho)}T_\nu\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* = \sum_{j=1}^\infty\sum_{i=1}^\infty\langle T_\nu k_{b_i}, k_{b_i+b_j}\rangle e_{b_i+b_j}\otimes e_{b_i}.$$

So with H_j defined by

$$H_j = \sum_{i=1}^\infty\langle T_\nu k_{b_i}, k_{b_i+b_j}\rangle e_{b_i+b_j}\otimes e_{b_i}, \tag{6.8}$$

we have

$$B^{(\rho)}T_\nu\left(B^{(\rho)}\right)^* = \sum_{j=1}^\infty H_j \tag{6.9}$$

and by Proposition 5.12

$$\left|\left|\sum_{j=1}^\infty H_j\right|^s\right|_\Phi \leq 2^{1-s}D_1\sum_{j=1}^\infty||H_j|^s|_\Phi \tag{6.10}$$

for some constant $D_1 > 0$. Combining (6.7), (6.9) and (6.10) together gives us

$$|\,(T_\nu)^s\,|_\Phi \leq 2^{1-s} C_2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} ||H_j|^s|_\Phi \tag{6.11}$$

where $C_2 = C_1 D_1$. By the definition of H_j and Proposition 5.10,

$$||H_j|^s|_\Phi = \Phi\left(\left\{|\langle T_\nu k_{b_i}, k_{b_i+b_j}\rangle|^s\right\}_{i=1}^{\infty}\right).$$

Let $i \geq 1$ and $j \geq 1$. Since $\|T_\nu\| < \infty$, Theorem 5.3 and Lemma 4.1 [15] implies

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\langle T_\nu k_{b_i}, k_{b_i+b_j}\rangle\right| &= \left|\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} k_{b_i}(z)\overline{k_{b_i+b_j}(z)}e^{-|z|^2}d\nu(z)\right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{C}^n}\left|k_{b_i}(z)\overline{k_{b_i+b_j}(z)}e^{-|z|^2}\right|d\nu(z) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} e^{\frac{-|z-b_i|^2}{2}} e^{\frac{-|z-(b_i+b_j)|^2}{2}} d\nu(z)\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

where the latter equality comes from direct calculation.

Now by the triangle inequality,

$$\frac{|b_j|}{2} \leq |z-b_i| \text{ or } \frac{|b_j|}{2} \leq |z-(b_i+b_j)| \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

If $\frac{|b_j|}{2} \leq |z-(b_i+b_j)|$, then $\frac{|b_j|^2}{8} + \frac{|z-b_i|^2}{2} \leq \frac{|z-(b_i+b_j)|^2}{2} + \frac{|z-b_i|^2}{2}$. Thus $\frac{|b_j|^2}{8} + \frac{|z-b_i|^2}{2} + \frac{|z-(b_i+b_j)|^2}{2} \leq |z-(b_i+b_j)|^2 + |z-b_i|^2$. Likewise if $\frac{|b_j|}{2} \leq |z-b_i|$ then $\frac{|b_j|^2}{8} + \frac{|z-b_i|^2}{2} + \frac{|z-(b_i+b_j)|^2}{2} \leq |z-(b_i+b_j)|^2 + |z-b_i|^2$. In either case,

$$e^{\frac{-|z-b_i|^2}{2}} e^{\frac{-|z-(b_i+b_j)|^2}{2}} \leq e^{\frac{-|b_j|^2}{16}} e^{\frac{-|z-b_i|^2}{4}} e^{\frac{-|z-(b_i+b_j)|^2}{4}}. \tag{6.13}$$

From (6.12) and (6.13) we obtain

$$\left|\langle T_\nu k_{b_i}, k_{b_i+b_j}\rangle\right|^s \leq e^{\frac{-s|b_j|^2}{16}}\left(\widetilde{\nu}_{\frac{1}{4}}(b_i)\right)^s \text{ for every } i \geq 1 \text{ and } j \geq 1. \tag{6.14}$$

Hence by Lemma 3,

$$||H_j|^s|_\Phi \leq e^{\frac{-s|b_j|^2}{16}}\Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widetilde{\nu}_{\frac{1}{4}}(b_i)\right)^s\right\}_{i=1}^{\infty}\right) \text{ for all } j \geq 1.$$

Thus by (6.11),

$$|\,(T_\nu)^s\,|_\Phi \leq 2^{1-s} C_2 \Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widetilde{\nu}_{\frac{1}{4}}(b_i)\right)^s\right\}_{i=1}^{\infty}\right)\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{\frac{-s|b_j|^2}{16}}.$$

By (2.1) and an argument similar to one used in the proof of Theorem 6.1 shows

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{\frac{-s|b_j|^2}{16}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{\frac{-s|b_j|_\infty^2}{16}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (2j+1)^{2n} e^{\frac{-s(\rho j)^2}{16}}$$

and the latter series converges by the Ratio Test for series. So in fact

$$|\,(T_\nu)^s\,|_\Phi \leq 2^{1-s} C_3 \Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widetilde{\nu}_{\frac{1}{4}}(b_i)\right)^s\right\}_{i=1}^{\infty}\right)$$

where $C_3 = C_2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{\frac{-s|b_j|^2}{16}}$. Then by Theorem 6.1

$$|\,(T_\nu)^s\,|_\Phi \leq C_4 \Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_\rho(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)$$

for some positive constant C_4.

For any $j \geq 1$, (2.2) and the definition of ρ implies there exist a unique $p_j \geq 1$ so that $a_{p_j} \in \overline{B\left(b_j, \frac{\rho}{2}\right)}$. Assume $|b_j - a_{p_j}|_\infty = \frac{\rho}{2}$. It follows from the definition of an r-lattice and the definition of ρ that $|Mw - d| = \frac{1}{2}$ for some $w, d \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus $\frac{1}{2} \in \mathbb{Z}$, which is a contradiction. So we must have $a_{p_j} \in B\left(b_j, \frac{\rho}{2}\right)$. Now if $p_j = p_q$ for some $q \neq j$, then by the triangle inequality, $|b_j - b_q|_\infty \leq |a_{p_j} - b_j|_\infty + |a_{p_j} - b_q|_\infty < \rho$. This is also a contradiction since $|b_q - b_j|_\infty \geq \rho$. Thus $j \neq q$ implies $p_j \neq p_q$. We also have $B(b_j, \rho) \subseteq B(a_{p_j}, \frac{3\rho}{2})$. It follows that $(\widehat{\nu}_\rho(b_j))^s \leq \left(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_{p_j})\right)^s$. Hence by Lemma 3,

$$\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_\rho(b_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq \Phi\left(\{\left(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_{p_j})\right)^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right).$$

It is also true by Proposition 5.9 and the above statements that

$$\Phi\left(\{\left(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_{p_j})\right)^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq \Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right).$$

Therefore with $C = C_4$,

$$|\,(T_\nu)^s\,|_\Phi \leq C\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right).$$

□

6.3. **Proof of Necessity.** We now prove the following theorem:

Theorem 6.3. *Let Φ be a symmetric norming function. Let $0 < s \leq 1$, $r > 0$ and $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be the r-lattice of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Let ν be a positive Borel measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$ and T_ν be the corresponding Toeplitz operator. Then there exists $D > 0$ so that*

$$\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq D|\,(T_\nu)^s\,|_\Phi.$$

Proof. If $|\,(T_\nu)^s\,|_\Phi = \infty$, then Theorem 6.3 clearly holds. So lets assume $|\,(T_\nu)^s\,|_\Phi < \infty$. Then by Remark 5.6, $(T_\nu)^s \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$. This implies $((T_\nu)^s)^{\frac{1}{s}} \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$. Moreover by definition, $((T_\nu)^s)^{\frac{1}{s}} = T_\nu$. Thus $T_\nu \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$.

Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \geq 2$ and $R = mr$. Let $A_m = \{(j_1 + iv_1, \ldots, j_n + iv_n) : \{j_q\}_{q=1}^n, \{v_q\}_{q=1}^n \subseteq \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, m-1\}\}$. For convenience, we write $A_m = \{y_j\}_{j=1}^{m^{2n}}$. For each $y_j \in A_m$, let Γ_{y_j} be the subset of $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ defined by $\Gamma_{y_j} = \{Ry + ry_j : y = (u_1 + iw_1, \ldots, u_n + iw_n)$ for some $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^n, \{w_j\}_{j=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{Z}\}$. It follows that if $\omega, \gamma \in \Gamma_{y_j}$ with $\omega \neq \gamma$ then $|\omega - \gamma|_\infty \geq R$. Also a straightforward application of the division algorithm for integers yields

$$\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty = \bigcup_{p=1}^{m^{2n}} \Gamma_{y_p} \text{ and } \Gamma_{y_1}, \Gamma_{y_2}, \ldots, \Gamma_{y_{m^{2n}}} \text{ are pairwise disjoint.} \quad (6.15)$$

Now fix p and write Γ_{y_p} as $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ for convenience. Let $\{e_{\rho_j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal set in H^2 and A be the operator defined on H^2 by

$$A = \sum_{j=1}^\infty k_{\rho_j} \otimes e_{\rho_j}.$$

Then $A(e_{\rho_j}) = k_{\rho_j}$ for all $j \geq 1$ and by a calculation almost identical to (6.4), $\|A\| \leq J$ for some constant $J = J(r, n) > 0$ and $A \in \mathfrak{L}(H^2)$. Moreover by definition of A,

$$A^* T_\nu A = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \sum_{j=1}^\infty \langle T_\nu k_{\rho_j}, k_{\rho_k} \rangle e_{\rho_k} \otimes e_{\rho_j}.$$

Let $\{v_q\}_{q=1}^\infty = \Gamma_{(0,\ldots,0)}$ and $\{w_q\}_{q=1}^\infty = \Gamma_{(0,\ldots,0)} \setminus \{(0, \ldots, 0)\}$ where $(0, \ldots, 0)$ is the origin of $\mathbb{C}^n$. By definition of $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, we have $\{\rho_d + v_q\}_{q=1}^\infty = \{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ for any $d \geq 1$. This and [6, page 188-191] imply

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=1}^\infty \sum_{j=1}^\infty \langle T_\nu k_{\rho_j}, k_{\rho_k} \rangle e_{\rho_k} \otimes e_{\rho_j} \\
&= \sum_{q=1}^\infty \sum_{j=1}^\infty \langle T_\nu k_{\rho_j}, k_{\rho_j + v_q} \rangle e_{\rho_j + v_q} \otimes e_{\rho_j} \\
&= \sum_j \langle T_\nu k_{\rho_j}, k_{\rho_j} \rangle e_{\rho_j} \otimes e_{\rho_j} + \sum_{q=1}^\infty \sum_{j=1}^\infty \langle T_\nu k_{\rho_j}, k_{\rho_j + w_q} \rangle e_{\rho_j + w_q} \otimes e_{\rho_j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$D = \sum_j \langle T_\nu k_{\rho_j}, k_{\rho_j}\rangle e_{\rho_j} \otimes e_{\rho_j} \text{ and } E = \sum_{q=1}^{\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle T_\nu k_{\rho_j}, k_{\rho_j+w_q}\rangle e_{\rho_j+w_q} \otimes e_{\rho_j}.$$

Thus $A^*T_\nu A = D + E$. It follows from Proposition 5.12 that

$$||D|^s|_\Phi \leq W 2^{1-s} \left(|(A^*T_\nu A)^s|_\Phi + ||E|^s|_\Phi\right)$$

for some $W > 0$ that is independent of m and $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$. A calculation similar to the one used to verify (6.7) shows $|(A^*T_\nu A)^s|_\Phi \leq C_1 |\left(T_\nu\right)^s|_\Phi$ where $C_1 > 0$ also does not depend on m or on $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$. This implies

$$||D|^s|_\Phi \leq 2^{1-s} W C_1 |\left(T_\nu\right)^s|_\Phi + W 2^{1-s} ||E|^s|_\Phi. \tag{6.16}$$

By Proposition 5.10, $||D|^s|_\Phi = \Phi\left(\{|\langle T_\nu k_{\rho_j}, k_{\rho_j}\rangle|^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right)$. Then since T_ν is bounded, (5.2) gives us $||D|^s|_\Phi = \Phi\left(\{(\widetilde{\nu}_1(\rho_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right)$. Then by Theorem 6.1,

$$e^{-sr^2(2n)} \Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(\rho_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \leq ||D|^s|_\Phi. \tag{6.17}$$

For each $q \geq 1$, let

$$E_q = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle T_\nu k_{\rho_j}, k_{\rho_j+w_q}\rangle e_{\rho_j+w_q} \otimes e_{\rho_j}.$$

Then

$$E = \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} E_q$$

and Proposition 5.12 implies

$$||E|^s|_\Phi \leq 2^{1-s} V_2 \left(\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} ||E_q|^s|_\Phi\right) \tag{6.18}$$

for some constant $V_2 > 0$ independent of both m and $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$. Furthermore Proposition 5.10 implies

$$||E_q|^s|_\Phi = \Phi\left(\{|\langle T_\nu k_{\rho_j}, k_{\rho_j+w_q}\rangle|^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right). \tag{6.19}$$

For each $q \geq 1$, $|w_q|_\infty \geq R$. So as in the proof of Theorem 5.4 on page 607 from [4],

$$e^{\frac{-|z-\rho_j|^2}{2}} e^{\frac{-|z-(\rho_j+w_q)|^2}{2}} \leq e^{\frac{-R^2}{16}} e^{\frac{-|z-\rho_j|^2}{4}} e^{\frac{-|z-(\rho_j+w_q)|^2}{4}}.$$

Then by a calculation similar to the one used to derive (6.13),

$$e^{\frac{-R^2}{16}} e^{\frac{-|z-\rho_j|^2}{4}} e^{\frac{-|z-(\rho_j+w_q)|^2}{4}} \leq e^{\frac{-R^2}{16}} e^{\frac{-|w_q|^2}{32}} e^{\frac{-|z-\rho_j|^2}{8}} e^{\frac{-|z-(\rho_j+w_q)|^2}{8}}.$$

It follows as in (6.12) that

$$|\langle T_\nu k_{\rho_j}, k_{\rho_j+w_q}\rangle|^s \leq e^{\frac{-sR^2}{16}} e^{\frac{-s|w_q|^2}{32}} \left(\widetilde{\nu}_{\frac{1}{8}}(\rho_j)\right)^s$$

Hence, by Lemma 3

$$\Phi\left(\{|\langle T_\nu k_{\rho_j}, k_{\rho_j+w_q}\rangle|^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \leq e^{\frac{-sR^2}{16}} e^{\frac{-s|w_q|^2}{32}} \Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widetilde{\nu}_{\frac{1}{8}}(\rho_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right).$$

Thus by (2.1), (6.18) and (6.19)

$$||E|^s|_\Phi \leq 2^{1-s} V_2 e^{\frac{-sR^2}{16}} \Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widetilde{\nu}_{\frac{1}{8}}(\rho_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right)\left(\sum_{q=1}^\infty e^{\frac{-s|w_q|_\infty^2}{32}}\right).$$

Since $\{w_q\}_{q=1}^\infty \subseteq \{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, $\sum_{q=1}^\infty e^{\frac{-s|w_q|_\infty^2}{32}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^\infty e^{\frac{-s|a_j|_\infty^2}{32}}$. Then by an argument similar to the one given in the proof of Theorem 6.1,

$$\sum_{j=1}^\infty e^{\frac{-s|a_j|_\infty^2}{32}} = \sum_{k=0}^\infty \sum_{\{j\in\mathbb{N}:|a_j|_\infty=rk\}} e^{\frac{-s|a_j|_\infty^2}{32}} \leq \sum_{k=0}^\infty (2k+1)^{2n} e^{\frac{-s(rk)^2}{32}}.$$

An application of the Ratio test for series shows $\sum_{k=0}^\infty (2k+1)^{2n} e^{\frac{-s(rk)^2}{32}}$ converges.

It follows that

$$||E|^s|_\Phi \leq C_2 e^{\frac{-sR^2}{16}} \Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widetilde{\nu}_{\frac{1}{8}}(\rho_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \tag{6.20}$$

where $C_2 = 2^{1-s} V_2 \sum_{k=0}^\infty (2k+1)^{2n} e^{\frac{-s(rk)^2}{32}}$.

So by (6.16), (6.17) and (6.20)

$$e^{-sr^2(2n)} \Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(\rho_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \leq$$

$$\leq W C_1 |(T_\nu)^s|_\Phi + 2^{1-s} W C_2 e^{\frac{-sR^2}{16}} \Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widetilde{\nu}_{\frac{1}{8}}(\rho_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right).$$

Since $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a subset of $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, we have for some $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $\rho_j = a_{v_j}$ for every $j \geq 1$ and such that $v_j \neq v_k$ for all $j \neq k$. So by Proposition 5.9,

$$\Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widetilde{\nu}_{\frac{1}{8}}(\rho_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \leq \Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widetilde{\nu}_{\frac{1}{8}}(a_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right).$$

Moreover by Theorem 6.1,

$$\Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widetilde{\nu}_{\frac{1}{8}}(a_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \leq C_3 \Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right)$$

where $C_3 = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(2j+1)^{2n}e^{-sr^2\alpha(j-2n)^2}$. It follows that

$$e^{-sr^2(2n)}\Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widehat{\nu}_r\left(\rho_j\right)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq \\ \leq WC_1|\left(T_\nu\right)^s|_\Phi + C_4 e^{\frac{-sR^2}{16}}\Phi\left(\left\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)$$

where $C_4 = 2^{1-s}C_2C_3W$. Since W, C_1 and C_4 are each independent of m and $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ we have

$$e^{-sr^2(2n)}\Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widehat{\nu}_r\left(w\right)\right)^s\right\}_{w\in\Gamma_{y_p}}\right) \leq \\ \leq WC_1|\left(T_\nu\right)^s|_\Phi + C_4 e^{\frac{-sR^2}{16}}\Phi\left(\left\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \tag{6.21}$$

for each $y_p \in A_m$.

Since $\Gamma_{y_1}, \ldots, \Gamma_{y_{m^{2n}}}$ partition $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$, basic properties of symmetric norming functions shows

$$\Phi\left(\left\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq \sum_{q=1}^{m^{2n}}\Phi\left(\left\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(w))^s\right\}_{w\in\Gamma_{y_q}}\right).$$

Then (6.21) give us

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{-sr^2(2n)}\Phi\left(\left\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \\ &\quad\leq e^{-sr^2(2n)}\sum_{q=1}^{m^{2n}}\Phi\left(\left\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(w))^s\right\}_{w\in\Gamma_{y_q}}\right) \\ &\quad\leq m^{2n}WC_1|\left(T_\nu\right)^s|_\Phi + m^{2n}C_4e^{\frac{-sR^2}{16}}\Phi\left(\left\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $R = mr$ where $m \geq 2$. Then choosing m large enough so that $C_4m^{2n}e^{\frac{-sR^2}{16}} \leq \frac{e^{-sr^2(2n)}}{2}$, we get from the above

$$e^{-sr^2(2n)}\Phi\left(\left\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq \\ \leq m^{2n}WC_1|\left(T_\nu\right)^s|_\Phi + \frac{e^{-sr^2(2n)}}{2}\Phi\left(\left\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right). \tag{6.22}$$

Let $N \geq 1$ and define $\nu_N(E) = \nu(E \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : |z| \leq N\})$ for every Borel set $E \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$. Since for any Borel set $E \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, $0 \leq \nu_N(E) \leq \nu(E)$, we have $0 \leq T_{\nu_N} \leq T_\nu$. Hence by Lemma 5.5

$$|\left(T_{\nu_N}\right)^s|_\Phi \leq |\left(T_\nu\right)^s|_\Phi. \tag{6.23}$$

Thus by (6.22)

$$e^{-sr^2(2n)}\Phi\left(\{((\widehat{\nu_N})_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq \\ \leq m^{2n}WC_1|\left(T_{\nu_N}\right)^s|_\Phi + \frac{e^{-sr^2(2n)}}{2}\Phi\left(\{((\widehat{\nu_N})_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right). \tag{6.24}$$

Note also that since ν_N has compact support, $\Phi\left(\{((\widehat{\nu_N})_r(a_j))^s\}\right) < \infty$. So the obvious cancellation in (6.24) gives us

$$\left(\frac{e^{-sr^2(2n)}}{2}\right)\Phi\left(\{((\widehat{\nu_N})_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq m^{2n}WC_1|\left(T_{\nu_N}\right)^s|_\Phi. \tag{6.25}$$

Then by (6.23),

$$\left(\frac{e^{-sr^2(2n)}}{2}\right)\Phi\left(\{((\widehat{\nu_N})_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq m^{2n}WC_1|\left(T_{\nu}\right)^s|_\Phi. \tag{6.26}$$

Hence

$$\sup_{N\geq 1}\left[\Phi\left(\{((\widehat{\nu_N})_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)\right] \leq m^{2n}2e^{sr^2(2n)}WC_1|\left(T_{\nu}\right)^s|_\Phi. \tag{6.27}$$

By (3.1) we have

$$\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq \sup_{N\geq 1}\left[\Phi\left(\{((\widehat{\nu_N})_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right)\right]. \tag{6.28}$$

Therefore combining (6.27) with (6.28) yields

$$\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) \leq m^{2n}2e^{sr^2(2n)}WC_1|\left(T_{\nu}\right)^s|_\Phi.$$

□

7. Important Corollaries

By Theorem 6.1, Theorem 6.2 and Theorem 6.3, we actually have the following corollary.

Corollary 7.1. *Let $0 < s \leq 1$, $\alpha > 0$, $r > 0$ and $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be the r-lattice of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Let ν be a positive Borel measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$ and T_ν be the corresponding Toeplitz operator. Then for any symmetric norming function Φ,*

$$|\left(T_\nu\right)^s|_\Phi < \infty \text{ if and only if } \Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) < \infty \\ \text{if and only if } \Phi\left(\{(\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\right) < \infty.$$

In such a case there exists positive constants $B_1 = B_1(r,s,n)$, $B_2 = B_2(r,\alpha,s,n)$, $B_3 = B_3(r,\alpha,s,n)$ *and* $B_4 = B_4(r,s,n)$ *so that*

$$\begin{aligned} |\,(T_\nu)^s\,|_\Phi &\leq B_1\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \\ &\leq B_1B_2\Phi\left(\{(\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \\ &\leq B_1B_2B_3\Phi\left(\{(\widehat{\nu}_r(a_j))^s\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \\ &\leq B_1B_2B_3B_4|\,(T_\nu)^s\,|_\Phi. \end{aligned}$$

7.1. **A Special Case.** Let $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{C}^n, dV)$ and $\alpha > 0$. Then we can define $\widetilde{f}_\alpha : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\widetilde{f}_\alpha(z) = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} f(w)e^{-\alpha|z-w|^2}dV(w).$$

Similarly, for any $r > 0$, we define $\widehat{f}_r : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\widehat{f}_r(z) = \int_{B(z,r)} f(w)dV(w).$$

Then if ν is defined by

$$d\nu(z) = f(z)dV(z),$$

we have $\frac{1}{\pi^n}T_\nu = T_f$, $\widehat{\nu}_r = \widehat{f}_r$, and $\widetilde{\nu}_\alpha = \widetilde{f}_\alpha$. Thus Corollary 7.1 yields the following corollary.

Corollary 7.2. *Let* $0 < s \leq 1$, $\alpha > 0$, $r > 0$ *and* $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ *be the* r*-lattice of* $\mathbb{C}^n$. *Let* $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{C}^n, dV)$ *with* $f \geq 0$ *and let* T_f *be the corresponding Toeplitz operator. Then for any symmetric norming function* Φ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\,(T_f)^s\,|_\Phi < \infty \text{ if and only if } &\Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widetilde{f}_\alpha(a_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) < \infty \\ \text{if and only if } &\Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widehat{f}_r(a_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

In such a case there exists positive constants $B_1 = B_1(r,s,n)$, $B_2 = B_2(r,\alpha,s,n)$, $B_3 = B_3(r,\alpha,s,n)$ *and* $B_4 = B_4(r,s,n)$ *so that*

$$\begin{aligned} |\,(T_f)^s\,|_\Phi &\leq B_1\Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widehat{f}_r(a_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \\ &\leq B_1B_2\Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widetilde{f}_\alpha(a_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \\ &\leq B_1B_2B_3\Phi\left(\left\{\left(\widehat{f}_r(a_j)\right)^s\right\}_{j=1}^\infty\right) \\ &\leq B_1B_2B_3B_4|\,(T_f)^s\,|_\Phi. \end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgment. The author would like to thank his dissertation committee for their help in writing this article: Dr. Jingbo Xia, Dr. Lewis Coburn and Dr. Ching Chou.

References

[1] J.Conway, *A Course in Functional Analysis*. 2nd edition. New York: Springer 2010.
[2] R. Douglas, *Banach Algebras Techniques in Operator Theory*. 2nd edition. New York: Springer 1998.
[3] I.C. Gohberg and M.G.Kreĭn, *Introduction to the Theory of Linear Nonselfadjoint Operators*. Translated from the Russian by A. Feinstein. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 18 Providence: American Mathematical Society, 1969.
[4] J. Isralowitz and K.Zhu, "Toeplitz Operators on The Fock Space." *Integral Equations and Operator Theory* 66, (2010): 593-611.
[5] S. Janson, J.Peetre and R.Rochberg, "Hankel Forms and the Fock Space." *Revista Matemática.Iberoamericana* 3.1(1987):104.
[6] H. Junghenn *A Course in Real Analysis*. CRC Press, 2015.
[7] J. Munkres, *Analysis on Manifolds*. California: Westview Press 1991.
[8] W. Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*. 3rd edition. McGraw-Hill Science/Engineering/Math, 1987.
[9] A.Schuster, and D.Varolin "Toeplitz Operators and Carleson Measures on Generalized Bargmann-Fock Spaces." *Integral Equations and Operator Theory* 72, (2012): 363-392.
[10] J.Xia "Bergman commutators and norm ideals." *Journal of Functional Analysis*. 263, (2012): 988-1039.
[11] J.Xia, "One Hundred years Of Diagonalization" (presentation), `http://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~jxia/Preprints/100yslides.pdf`
[12] K.Zhu, *Analysis on Fock Spaces*. New York: Springer 2012.
[13] K.Zhu, *An Introduction to Operator Algebras*. Boca Raton: CRC Press Inc 2000.
[14] K.Zhu, *Operator Theory in Function Spaces*. 2nd edition.Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 138. Providence: American Mathematical Society, 2007.
[15] Z.Hu and X.Lv "Toeplitz Operators from One Fock Space to Another." *Integral equations and Operator Theory* 70, (2011): 554-555.

244 Mathematics Building, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, 14260
E-mail address: `adamoren@buffalo.edu`